



Agency Feasibility and Completeness Analysis

This guide is intended to facilitate the agency review of rocky habitat site management designation proposals during the Initial Proposal Period of the Territorial Sea Plan – Part Three (TSP3) amendment process. Proposals will be assessed for completeness to determine if all necessary information has been included in the proposal, and that it is sufficient in nature to conduct agency review. Agency representatives (e.g. ODFW, OPRD, DSL, DLCDC, or others based on the details of individual proposals) will then provide analyses of the practical feasibility of implementing the proposal under relevant agency authority and jurisdiction, including alignment with the goals and policies of the Rocky Habitat Management Strategy.¹ Oregon Coastal Management Program staff will also forward proposals to federally-recognized Oregon Tribal Nations with interests in the coastal zone², and may engage in consultation as necessary.

Questions

Please fill in information and answer the questions below for *each* rocky habitat site designation proposal, and provide a brief summary report at the end. Please provide additional information, interpretation, concerns, or context where necessary. Some of the information may be duplicative with the Working Group evaluation to ensure consistent interpretation, transparency, accountability, and historic preservation.

Evaluator name(s): Andy Lanier, Michael Moses, David Fox, Laurel Hillmann, Andrea Celentano, Shawn Stephensen

Evaluator role/position(s): Rocky Habitat Working Group Agency Staff

Evaluator affiliation(s): DLCDC, ODFW, OPRD, ODSL, USFWS

Date of evaluation: January, 2021

¹ TSP3 Sections E. 3. & 4. Step 2 – Agency Feasibility & Completeness Analysis

² Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, Coquille Indian Tribe, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, and Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians

Site Information

Site Information

Proposed site location: Seal Rock

Designation category:

Marine Research Area

Marine Garden/Education Area

Marine Conservation Area

Is this a proposal to add, delete, or modify a rocky habitat site designation?

New Site Designation (addition)

Existing Site Removal (deletion)

Alteration to Existing Site

Name of principal contact: Meredith Payne

Affiliated organization(s): submitting as an individual

Date of proposal submission: December 28, 2020

Proposal Completeness

Please answer each of the following questions as it relates to the completeness of the proposal.

1. *Is the proposal complete? Have sufficient responses been provided for all questions, including indications or explanations for those questions which are not relevant or applicable? If not, please indicate which question(s) are of concern.*

Many proposal prompts are incomplete or do not provide sufficient information or rationale to facilitate proper analysis. These sections include: Goals, Enforcement Changes, Needed Regulations, Improvements to Management, Management Mechanisms, Stakeholder Engagement, and Outreach.

2. *Have sufficient data, information, and/or other relevant materials been provided in order to facilitate proper review and evaluation of the proposed designation?*

Broadly, this proposal does not meet the sufficiency standards for understanding goals, intents, purpose, and the suggested management changes. While the spatial analysis it relied upon is potentially informative, it does not include all the requisite factors agencies would consider in analyzing proposals. Additionally, the inclusion of a significant proportion of subtidal habitat is insufficiently justified and potentially concerning as it could be interpreted as a new marine reserve proposal.

3. *Is a rationale provided for any incomplete or missing information?*

No

4. *Does the proposal consist of one place-based submission? (A small network of designated sites is acceptable, provided they are all the same designation category.)*

Yes

Reviewer Comments and Feedback

In the space below, please provide a (brief) summary of the feasibility of this proposal, and a rationale for recommendation. If more space is required, please attach additional pages.

At this time, this proposal does not meet the completeness and sufficiency standards to facilitate proper proposal review. The proposal as submitted was incomplete with regard to the following sections: Goals, Enforcement Changes, Needed Regulations, Improvements to Management, Management Mechanisms, Stakeholder Engagement, and Outreach. Without additional efforts to provide sufficient information and rationale in these sections, the proposal cannot be properly analyzed.

While Seal Rock is an important rocky site that may be deserving of site-specific management, at this time the agencies are recommending that this proposal not move forward for additional merit-based review. The proposal may be revised and resubmitted for reconsideration at a later date (after October 1, 2021).

The agencies participating in the rocky habitat site management designation process (DLCD, OPRD, ODFW, DSL, USFWS), acknowledge the significant effort made by the proposer to develop this proposal, and thank them for their careful efforts to highlight the needs and concerns at this site.